[திரு. எம். பக்தவத்சலம்] [11th August 1965

ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபன நிர்வாகத்தின் மேற்பார்வை பொறுப்பை அது ஏற்றுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது. அரசாங்கம் கட்சி வகையிலே எந்த நடவடிக்கைகளையும் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளாது; மற்ற நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவும் தயங்காது, என்று கூறி என்னுடைய வார்த்தைகளை முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

'That the Madras City Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 16 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be passed.'

The Motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

(2) THE MADRAS APPROPRIATION (NO. 4) BILL, 1965 (L.A. BILL NO. 21 OF 1965).

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, I move—

'That the Madras Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, [a] 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 21 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration.'

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to . . .

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Sir, the convention in this House is that no speeches are made on the Appropriaton Bill.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Last year we were allowed to speak. There was a convention two years before. What I wish to submit to the House is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : Five minutes' speaking will perhaps solve the problem.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Now, the Appropriation Bill is providing for amounts . . .

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Sir, it is better to follow the convention of not speaking on the Appropriation Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member will kindly advise his friend.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : I am bound to tell the Chairman the convention.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member Sri G. Krishnamoorthy is amenable too.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : I wish to submit that this House does not have an opportunity to just discuss the various Demands in respect of Education and others. We have got a lot to say . . .

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 45–47.

11th August 1965]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Hon. the Chief Minister just now was saying so much about tradition. Now, so soon after that, if the hon. Member is going to speak . . .

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : If there are any special points in respect of items in the budget to be discussed, then with the permission of the Chair, once or two hon. Members are allowed to speak. But with reference to the supplementary estimates, we had no discussion on the Appropriation Bill. We speak on the supplementary estimates and not on the Appropriation Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

'That the Madras Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 21 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration.'

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clause 2 and the Schedule were put and carried.

Clause 1, the long title, and the Enacting-Formula were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, I move—

'That the Madras Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 21 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be passed.'

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Sir, L wish to submit that paragraph 3 in rule 131 of the Council Rules says—

'Provided further that, in the case of an Appropriation Bill, no amendments shall be proposed to any such Bill . . .'

This clearly shows that we have a right to represent matters here. Under Article 205 of the Constitution, an Appropriation Bill or a supplementary demand is to be taken up for discussion, like budget. There is nothing to prevent an hon. Member from making a representation in this House especially on matters which involve the finances of this State and for which sufficient amounts have been provided in this Appropriation Bill. I shall submit to the Chair's ruling, but I wish to submit that a Member has always got a right to speak on the Appropriation Bill. Even if there be a convention against that, it need not be observed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is tradition.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Sir, the hon. Member has made certain observations. I want to clarify the position. That a Member of the Legislature has got a right to speak, has never been questioned or doubted in any legislature anywhere in the world. But the right to speak is always regulated by rules

as well as conventions. If rules alone should regulate speeches, then there will be no conventions, and we need not speak of conventions. But it has always been accepted in all the legislatures that debates are governed by both rules and conventions, and in this case the convention has been right through upheld except, as I said, in the general debate, when the Appropriation Bill comes, a Member can speak with the permission of the Chair if there are one or two items in respect of which there was no opportunity to speak.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : I would like to have a clarification from the Hon. Minister. Even in respect of a supplementary demand, has not an hon. Member the right to speak on the concerned Appropriation Bill?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : I said on the Appropriation Bill on a supplementary demand.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Sir, Rule 154 of the Council Rule says, ' Subject to the provisions of the Constitution, the procedure in regard to an Appropriation Bill shall be the same as for Bills ', etc. We have got a clear wording that this is a Bill just as other Bills. There are three stages. We have now come to the third reading stage. This enables a member, according to parliamentary procedure, to have a discussion. So a Member has got that right and that need not be denied, and conventions can be broken, inasmuch as the expenditure on the administrative machinery has gone up now and Members of the Upper House who have no opportunity to discuss the demands must be given as many opportunities as are available. Rules and conventions should be broken if more opportunities are to be given to Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I can understand convention being broken, but it should not be broken for the sake of one Member against many others.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Sir, the Appopriation Bill comes up for discussion after the whole budget has been discussed. When the supplementary demands come up, we again discuss them. There is a difference between the Assembly and the Legislative Council as regards the powers. There, after the general discussion, there is voting on demands, which we do not have here. The Government, the Leader of the House, and everybody is agreed that we can make specific grievances in the budget discussion itself. Properly speaking the convention may not be allowed there. But the convention is observed on the Appropriation Bill. When there is a general discussion in the Legislative Council, then we do speak on particular matters. We have been doing so. There are people who speak largely about education. They speak on some points for 12 hours and 8 hours and so on. I am not questioning their right. I am only pointing out that this has been the practice and therefore the Appropriation Bill follows all this. We cannot go on repeating and discussing

it. It will be then an endless affair. Supposing on March 29, the Appropriation Bill comes up here, and in exercise of the right to speak, we go on speaking till April 1, what will happen? There must be some reason. Therefore, we have to follow the convention and tradition here.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall follow the tradition here. The question is—

'That the Madras Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 21 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be passed.'

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I may inform hon. Members that the House will sit today till 5 p.m.

(3) THE MADRAS BUILDINGS (LEASE AND RENT CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL, 1965 (L.A. BILL NO. 23 OF 1965.)

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I move—

"That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, [a] 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 23 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration."

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved—

"That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 23 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration."

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Bill has not come a day too soon. It must have been brought before the House long ago. I am happy however that the Madras Government have brought in this Bill recognising the need for it at least now. So far they have recognised only the allopaethic system of medicine. Now, under the revised Bill, practitioners of other systems of medicine, such as Homoeopathy and Ayurveda are also to be recognised . . .

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Bill that I have just now moved relates to Rent Control. The other Bill will come up later.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : I am sorry, Sir.

*SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Bill has come before the House for extension of the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act for a further term. This was first brought in as an emergent measure to see that Government servants and others got suitable accommodation at reasonable rents. I do not see any reason why the term of this legislation should be extended by two years, five years, and so on. For one 4-30 p.m.

[a] Printed as Appendix III on page 47.